

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/679,119	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HOFFMAN, ROGER P.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jonathan Ouellette	<b>Art Unit</b> 3629	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jonathan Ouellette. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Philip Weiss. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 01 February 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: Independent Claims.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hogge.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner Ouellette and Mr. Weiss discussed the prior art (Hogge) and compared it to the claimed invention. Examiner Ouellette explained the similarities between the claimed invention and the production planning system disclosed by Hogge. Mr. Weiss Suggested amending the independent claims to read and apply to "continuous processing manufacturing facilities," as the economics are quite different from that of product manufacturing facilities, as disclosed by the prior art. Examiner Ouellette agreed that such an amendment would move the case forward and possible read over the prior art, but that the amendment would require additional search and consideration before a determination of allowability could be made.